



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,784	06/19/2001	Tsutomu Kono	16869S028400	2346

20350 7590 10/03/2002  
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

NGO, HUNG V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2831	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/884,784</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Kono et al</b>	
	Examiner <b>Hung V. Ngo</b>	Art Unit <b>2831</b>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.

- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 9, 2002

2a)  This action is FINAL.      2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) 10-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-9 and 13 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All b)  Some\* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 5, 6

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2831

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

Claim 13 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, lines 3-4, "at least one through holes" is unclear. The examiner suggests --at least one through hole--.

Claim 1, line 11-12, "which is not joined to said components" is unclear because of lines 5-6.

Claim 1, line 10, after "board", insert --and--.

Claim 2, line 9, after "board", insert --and--.

Claim 3, line 9, "at at" is unclear.

Claim 3, line 10, "metal base boards" is confusing.

Art Unit: 2831

Claim 3, lines 11-12 are unclear.

Claim 4, line 8, "except for" is confusing.

Claims 5, 6 have similar problems as claim 4.

Claim 7, line 3, "at least one through hole" is unclear. Is it the same through hole as claim 1?

Claim 9, line 4, "at at" is unclear.

Claim 9, line 5, "said through holes" is unclear. The examiner suggests --said through

hole--.

Claims 8, 13 are included because of their dependencies.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Mosquera et al.

Mosquera et al disclose a metal base board (50, 70), having at least one through hole (156, 157), at least one wall, a terminal part having covex or concave shape (90, 106), at least one component (52, 80), a notch (Fig 4), a concave (136)

Art Unit: 2831

3. Claims 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chan et al.

Chan et al disclose a metal base (46) a side wall formed on chassis (20), one or more components (52, 54), notch (Fig 4),

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-6, 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan et al. Chan et al disclose a metal base (46) a side wall formed on chassis (20), one or more components (52, 54), notch (Fig 4), but does not disclose a thickness of the metal base board.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the thickness of Chan et al by employing the specific range of thicknesses since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in prior art, discovering optimum ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Art Unit: 2831

***Communication***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung V. Ngo whose telephone number is (703) 308-7614. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 8:30 am to 06:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard, can be reached on (703) 308-3682.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3431 or (703) 305-3432.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

*Hung V. Ngo*

Hung V. Ngo

September 26, 2002

HUNG V. NGO  
PATENT EXAMINER